

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 14, and 18, leaving Claims 1-20 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. §103(a), have been traversed, that no new matter has been entered, and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner specifically points to the limitations “identifying a resource locator string associated with the fetched document” and “placing the resource locator string for the fetched document in a blacklist in order to prevent future crawling of the fetched document” as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that it is unclear as to whether the Applicants are referring to the fetched documents which are crawled or the disallowed fetched documents. The Examiner suggests that Applicants amend the aforementioned limitations by replacing “fetch documents” with “disallowed feteched documents” to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, and 18 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. It is submitted that claims 1, 14, and 18 now meet all applicable requirements of 35 USC 112.

Claims 2-13, 15-17, and 19-20 were rejected for incorporating the deficiencies of independent claim 1, 14, and 18. Since claims 1, 14, and 18 have been amended to meet

the requirements of 35 USC 112, it is submitted that claims 2-13, 15-17, and 19-20 now also meet the requirements of 35 USC 112.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 14 because of the following informality: The phrase “wherein the fourth set of instructions codes further determines” should be changed to “wherein the fourth set of instructions codes further determine”. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 14 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. It is submitted that the informality of claim 14 has been corrected, thereby overcoming the Examiner’s objection to claims 14 and 15-17. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these objections, which Applicant considers to be overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakrabarti et al. (U.S. Patent 6,418,433) in view of Liang (U.S. PGPUB 2001/0044818).

Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reasons. The Examiner’s obviousness rejection based on Chakrabarti in view of Liang is improper as Chakrabarti and Liang fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the instant invention in such a manner as to perform as the claimed invention performs. For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are taught or suggested in the prior art. MPEP §2143.03.

Independent claims 1, 14 and 18 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, crawling the fetched document that matches any of the focus topics such that the fetched document is crawled only once even if the fetched document matches a plurality of the

focus topics, wherein the fetched document comprises a document of interest for access by a user. In this manner, Applicants' invention conserves processing resources of both the crawling system and the web sites being crawled. Support for the foregoing recitations is found throughout Applicants' specification. Refer, for example, to Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0017] and [0018]. No new matter has been added.

Chakrabarti discloses a focused web crawler that learns to recognize web pages of interest to users based upon a set of examples provided by the users. The crawler then explores the web, starting from the sample set, using collected statistics to guide itself towards relevant resources and away from irrelevant material on the web. With reference to col. 3, lines 13-30, Chakrabarti assigns a revisit priority to a web page. At least one "watchdog" module is provided that periodically determines new and old pages to consider. One or more worker modules respond to the watchdog module to access the new and old pages. Each web page is associated with a respective field that represents the number of times the respective page has been accessed.

The technique disclosed in Chakrabarti differs vastly from the approach set forth in Applicants' claims 1, 14, and 18. More specifically, Chakrabarti's page revisit process is completely distinguishable from Applicants' claimed approach which crawls a fetched document only one time. Chakrabarti fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed procedures and systems for crawling a document such that the fetched document is crawled only once even if the fetched document matches a plurality of the focus topics.

Liang fails to remedy the deficiencies of Chakrabarti. Liang discloses a system and method for identifying and blocking unacceptable web content. A proxy server is connected between a client and the Internet. The proxy server processes image content retrieved from a website to determine whether or not the content comprises skin tones and textures. If so, the proxy server blocks the content from the client. A black list is maintained of known pornographic sites (refer, for example, to paragraphs [0005] and [0024]). Liang fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed procedures and systems

for crawling a document such that the fetched document is crawled only once even if the fetched document matches a plurality of the focus topics, wherein the fetched document comprises a document of interest for access by a user.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Liang and Chakrabarti fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 14, and 18. It is further submitted that independent claims 1, 14, and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-13 depend from independent claim 1 and include all recitations thereof. Similarly, claims 15-17 depend from independent claim 14 and include all recitations thereof. Finally, claims 19 and 20 depend from independent claim 18 and includes all recitations thereof. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-13, 15-17 and 19-20 are allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons indicated above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 18.

Chakrabarti and Liang are wholly inadequate in their teaching of the claimed invention as a whole, fail to motivate one skilled in the art to do what Applicants have done, fail to recognize a problem recognized and solved only by the present invention, and disclose a substantially different invention from the claimed invention, and therefore cannot properly be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and Applicants now consider this rejection to be traversed.

Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakrabarti et al. (U.S. Patent 6,418,433) in view of Liang (U.S. PGPUB 2001/0044818) and further in view of Heydon et al. .

Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reasons. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 1 and include all recitations thereof. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, crawling the fetched document that matches any of the focus topics such that the fetched document is crawled only once even if the fetched document matches a plurality of the focus topics, wherein the fetched document comprises a

document of interest for access by a user. These recitations are neither disclosed in, nor suggested by, Chakrabarti, Liang, or Heydon. Moreover, in view of the foregoing analysis, Applicants' claimed methods as set forth in claims 10-13 are patentable over Chakrabarti in view of Liang and further in view of Heydon at least for the reason that claims 10-13 depend from an allowable base claim.

Additionally, Applicants submit that Chakrabarti, Liang, and Heydon fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention and are therefore wholly inadequate in their teaching of the claimed invention as a whole, fail to motivate one skilled in the art to do what Applicants have done, fail to recognize a problem recognized and solved only by the present invention, and disclose a substantially different invention from the claimed invention, and therefore cannot properly be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and Applicants now consider this rejection to be traversed.

Upon entry of these amendments and arguments, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), have been traversed, and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is therefore respectfully requested.

If a communication with Applicants' Attorneys would assist in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned so that any such issues may be promptly resolved.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 09-0441.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By: /Steven R. Bartholomew/

Steven R. Bartholomew
Registration No: 34,771
Customer No. 67232

Date: September 19, 2007
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115